Table 2 SR 504 Extension Feasibility Study Option Evaluation Matrix

			3 + 10/18/19/19 19/10 3 + 10/10 3 +	\$ /.	\$ /	25 @ 100 mm of the free of the				10 - Sampan Comment of the following of	\$ \\ \frac{\partial \text{S}}{\partial \text{S}} \\ \partial \text	Solition Ball of Color of Colo	Parish Wings to the South of S	**************************************
		2. Hoffigal (4 to 5. miles)		7. 8 MINT/Silo CO) 0 US 4. HOF Silo CO		100 TO				1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	* 10 P	, 10 th	7 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	14-Color Swift Reserve
Option	ns /	Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z	Y Visito	7. 18. 18. 18. 18. 18. 18. 18. 18. 18. 18	Nisio Pogo Second	7. 18 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16	S Visite (Note Single	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\		\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	8 0 8 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	\$ \$ \$ \$ \ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \	\ 8 V. Si.
			# \ @ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \			\$ 3 2/ S' \$. 6 6 6 8 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	% & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &	\$ 5 \ \$ \$ \ 5 \ \ 7 \ 7			7 2 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7	0 2 8 0 8 0 8 0 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	
	forsts		2 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 2 /	, 5 / Sept. 1	0 /0 /0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		\$ / S	3/3	8 / 9 C		\$ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\			
Occupation Official (File of Occup)	\\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	/ ×	\ \frac{2}{\frac{2}{2}}	/ * %		/ ç	/ ^ ~	/ & E	v / % &	0 6	\ <u>``</u> ```	/ 2 g	-/ 5 E	\ \\ \frac{\partial 2}{2}
Screening Criteria (Effect/Cost)														
Project Purpose and Need														
Connecting East & West Sides Loop Connect MSH, Mt Rainier, Gorge & Eastern WA														3
Improve Economic Development Opportunities				Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ö	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ		
Improve Resident Access	0	0				0	0	0			•			0
Improve Visitor Access														0
Provide Shorter Emergency Route Provide Year-Round Emergency Evacuation Route	+8	8				8	8							
Evironmentally Acceptable	10	Ŏ		Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ		Ŏ		ŏ		Ŏ
Engineering & Cost Feasibility	0				Ò				Ò		Ŏ			Ŏ
			1						1					
Environmental Criteria														
Terrestrial Wildlife Resources and Habitat Impacts Stream Alteration and Riparian Encroachment											0			
Terrestrial Threatened & Endangered Species Impacts	Ŏ					Ö				Ĭ	Ĭ	Ö		
Aquatic Threatened and Endangered Species Impacts	0	0			•	•	•		•	Ŏ	Ŏ			Ŏ
Wetlands Impacts											\bigcirc			
Impacts to Noise Sensitive Receptors														
Recreation Area Impacts Historic Properties Impacts	+	$\stackrel{\smile}{\sim}$		8		8	8	$\overline{}$						
Visual Impacts	Tŏ	Ŏ	$\stackrel{\smile}{\circ}$	Ŏ		ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ			Ŏ	Ŏ	Ĭ	ŏ
Impacts to GPNF Roadless Areas	Ō	Ŏ	Ŏ			Ŏ	Ŏ					Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ
Impacts to Late Successional Reserves	0	Ŏ	0	0	•	0	0	0	•	Ď		0	Q	0
Consistency with National Monument Management Plan	12	$\vdash \bigcirc$												
Impact on NVM Scientific Research	+	0		0		0	0	0			•			
Engineering Criteria			<u> </u>						<u> </u>			 		
Capital Costs														
Operation & Maintenance Costs	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ		Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ			Õ		Õ	
Access/Travel Patterns Impacts	<u> </u>		<u> </u>											
To Randle														
To Cougar														0
Year-Round Access Geotechnical Elements	$+\delta$	8	$\stackrel{\smile}{\sim}$	8		8	18	$\stackrel{\smile}{\sim}$						
Number of Bridges	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ
Right-of-Way Acquisition														
USFS: Monument	12		12				12				0			
USFS : Non-Monument				0			0	0	8		00	8		
WDNR Private	+ =								+		8	18	18	
Topographic Indicators									† –			 	 	
Grades over 10%									0			Q	O	0
No. of Passes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	•	
Economia Cuita-i-			1		1				1			1	1	
Economic Criteria Opportunity for Economic Growth			1		1				1			1	1	
Opportunity for Economic Growth Clark County														0
Cowlitz County													Ö	Ŏ
Lewis County	Q	Ŏ	Ŏ			Ŏ	Ŏ							
Skamania County				0	0			0	0		0	0	0	0
Yakima County							0	0				0		
Distribution of Benefits			+		1				+				1	
Increased Access Local Resident Travel														
Public Land Management	Ť	Ŏ	Ŏ			Ŏ	ĬŎ	Ŏ		Ö		Ö	ŏ	ŏ
Public Safety	Ō	Ō	Ŏ			Ŏ	Ŏ						Ŏ	
Recreation Sites				0	0			0	O	0	0	0	0	0
Monument Attractions												0		0
Reduced Travel Costs														
Local Residents Public Land Management	+ -					Ĭ	Ĭ							Ĭ
Public Safety		Ō			Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ		ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ		
Tourists		Ŏ	Ŏ	Ó	Ō	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ō	Ō	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ		
Private Landowners & Forest Industry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Distribution of Costs			1		1				1				1	
Road Construction, Operation, & Maintenance	+											 _ _ _ _ _ _ 	 _ _ _ _ _ 	
Local												8		
State Federal										Ĭ	Ĭ	Ť	Ĭ	Ĭ
Access	1							L						
Private Land Management & Protection									0	0	0	0	0	0
Public Safety	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	•	•			•
Public Land Management & Protection														

Criteria Legend					
	Minimal Impact				
0	Least Costly				
	Highest Benefit				
	Mid-Range				
	Major Impact				
	Most Costly				
	Least Benefit				